REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed April 14, 2005 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 14, 16, and 24 have been amended to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. Support for these changes may be found in the specification, page 6, [0024]. No new matter has been added.

The First 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 9-21 and 23-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Franklin et al. (USP 5,575,362) for the same reasons as set forth in the Office Action dated October 15, 2004. Claims 9, 14, 16, and 24 are independent claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to the M.P.E.P., a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.[1]

Amended Claim 9 provides that "said top can be collapsed into said concave part in a storage position." Claims 14, 16, and 24 provide for a similar limitation.

[1] Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 2131. See also *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Franklin does not teach or suggest having a top that can be collapsed into the concave part of the external rigid support member. Accordingly, it can not be said to anticipate the claimed invention.

As to dependent claims 10-13, 15, 17-21, 23, and 25-30, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Request for Entry of Amendment

Entry of this Amendment will place the Application in better condition for allowance, or at the least, narrow any issues for an appeal. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment is appropriate and is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID & PRIEST, LLP

Dated: June 14, 2005

Adrienne Yeung
Reg. No. 44,000

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040